

CJIS Board Meeting

April 25, 2008 – 1:00 PM - 2:30 PM

Chief Justice's Office ~ 1st Floor, Supreme Court

Attendees:

Thomas L. Trenbeath, Chief Justice VandeWalle, Lisa Feldner, Pam Schafer, Leann Bertsch (via phone), Chuck Placek, Nancy Walz and Sue Davenport

APPROVE MINUTES

Motion made by Thomas L. Trenbeath to approve previous meeting minutes. Seconded by Lisa Feldner.

STATUS Report

Pam distributed the CJIS status reports for review. It was asked if LERMS accounts have dropped. Hazen PD is the first to have discontinued LERMS. When Darin Anderson returns from leave, Pam plans to have him meet with potential customers to build relationships.

CJIS PORTAL 2.0

Pam distributed a handout of the revised CJIS Portal 2.0 cost estimate from ITD. CJIS's desire was to have a detailed cost estimate to track progress expenditures and outcomes. The analysis phase is completed and project is on hold at the moment. At current estimates, the project would be able to be implemented by Oct 17th at a cost of \$327,000. The project's proposal/plan is not complete. Pam would like the boards' approval to look at this to move forward.

Nancy's main concern is the original estimate was not based on enough information. Now with more info, we want to know this is not going to exceed the dollar amount at the end of the project. We will ask for more detail and get tight controls to be sure we do not go over this number. This is not a fixed price bid. The money is coming from budgeted CJIS project money. The money is coming from the discontinued Court's project and the budgeted LERMS projects. LERMS integration project dollars should be lowered and be able to be re-directed to this project. This could be an issue if we are going to have to go back and ask legislature for some money. We are using these dollars for something we didn't tell the legislature we were using them for. Chuck replied the project itself is the portal enhancement. If this had been in place beforehand, the other costs would have dropped somewhere around 20%. This allows for cheaper integration in the future rather than the individual customization. Chief still suggests we document a good explanation ahead of time for the legislature. We would have our big 4 integrated with the money. Nancy said we could tell the Courts about the analysis and have the plan there for next time. We could spend some dollars in that area. The Chief asked if this will reduce the cost for Courts and for LERMS. Pam said it definitely would. The CJIS Portal 2.0 Project Charter is a draft copy. We need to update the Portal 2.0 Business Case. Pam is looking for the approval to move forward. We are going to contract with ITD and are meeting next week to get this figured out. Chief asked how far was the cost

estimate was over. Pam said it was \$120,000 over the budgeted estimate. Lisa is frustrated with ITD's inability to see why we have issues. Nancy said Gordon technically knows what he needs, it can be done but Pam is concerned about the cost and potential of cost to rise. The Chief asked why we had not done this earlier if it could have been completed. Lisa said it has to do with having Gordon on staff as he has been a great asset. Nancy added that new technology and national standards are also denominators. The Chief thinks we should go ahead with it. Pam or Gordon need to document why it's being spent and why we didn't use some of the designated funds. A good explanation to the legislatures is important. Hope we can get it before next session and affirm why we did it this way before they ask for it. Pam will talk to Rep. Skarphol and inform him of CJIS efforts. The Chief moves for authorization to proceed with the Portal 2.0 project. Tom seconds. Motion carried.

PROJECT DISCUSSIONS: CJIS PORTAL SECURITY, LERMS Integration, Cruiser Project

Gordon is unable to attend, Pam discussed the information Gordon provided on the CJIS Portal Security. Pam needs a motion from the board to proceed with the CJIS Firewall Configuration. We had discussed the way it was done and a proposed new way. This would remove the VPN process and still have the firewall. We've discussed with Executive Committee and with AL Veit. We will gather baseline activity for one month, then open the firewall and watch for two months to make a decision to keep it or not.

Tom thinks we should go ahead with it. Lisa agrees. Pam said that is where we get a lot of tech calls.

Chief Justice proposed to try for a couple of months and report back to this group before choosing this solution. Lisa said ITD may have another solution in the near future. We have a consensus to go ahead with this.

The Local Law Enforcement Project is on hold until Portal 2.0 is implemented. Cruiser project will be live mid-May in a limited capacity.

Chief has been hearing about license plate readers. Is that another project? We had talked about upcoming projects. Chuck explained how those work and the technology is out there. In ND, we have them at the border crossings. Chief said we need to be sure to accomplish what is on our plate first before we move into other projects. This is something we can look at or analyze for the next biennium. CJIS will have a central place to share that info.

SAVIN PROJECT

The budget was approved with no issues. Nancy said Pam and Amy did a lot of leg work to get to that point. Sheila Peterson, OMB Fiscal Management Director, answered the questions as she handles the budget.

Pam submitted the SAVIN financial status report to BJA. The Judiciary Committee was updated and accepting of it. One issue was brought up on who would be responsible for reporting. Senator moved that we develop a bill draft. Vonette staffs that committee.

SAVIN PROGRAM MANGER

Nineteen candidates were reviewed and ranked; of the 19 candidate's seven candidates were interviewed. Pam, Shelly Miller (ITD HR officer), Terry Traynor (NDACo), Shelly Carlson (Savin Governance Committee member and NDCAWS) were included in the interview process. Each candidate had an interview lasting approximately two hours. The interview committee selected the top candidate. The person's qualification was discussed with the board. The Chief had questions if too much scoring emphasis was put on victim experience. After a brief discussion of the scoring, all decided it was scored correctly. Nancy feels the committee is ready to make an offer to the individual. The board was asked if they would like to bring back the candidates for an interview with the board. Tom asks Pam if she's comfortable with the candidates. Pam said the top candidate was clearly ahead of any other candidates.

The board agreed to meet the candidate and ask questions before an offer is made. Pam will set up an interview with the board including Leann as soon as possible. Pam will give the board some questions but the board would like to ask their own. Lisa thinks we should get the reference checks finished. Chuck has kept an arm's length and does not want to influence the direction. Pam will send out letters to the other candidates informing them of the status of the position.

IJIS STUDY -STATE RADIO/CJIS

The IJIS Study was held over two days. Stakeholders including executive and technical people were invited to attend from all involved agencies. Pam went over the breakout of meetings, what they cover and who would attend. Pam asked if the board has anything they would like to see or what their expectations are. Tom thinks they are looking at both ideas and what can be done to prevent overlap. Chuck agrees we need to identify ways to stop overlap.

Adjourned at 2:11pm.